

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The present amendment is in response to the final Office Action mailed June 23, 2004, in which Claims 1 through 15 were rejected. Applicant has thoroughly reviewed the outstanding Office Action including the Examiner's remarks and the reference cited therein. The following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action and, when coupled with the amendments made herein, are believed to render all claims at issue patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, 14 and 15 are amended herein. Claim 2 is cancelled. No claims are added. Accordingly, Claims 1 and 3 through 15 remain pending.

All the changes are made for clarification and are based on the application and drawings as originally filed. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

### **CLAIM OBJECTIONS**

With respect to page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claims 5, 6, 7, and 14 as requiring either sufficient antecedent basis or clarification.

Applicant has amended each of these claims to overcome the objections. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's objections to these claims are respectfully requested.

### CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. SECTION 103(a)

With respect to pages 2 through 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 through 15 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2,724,465 to Krauss *et al.* (hereinafter known as "Krauss *et al.*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,506,482 to Pracht *et al.* (hereinafter known as "Pracht *et al.*").

Claims 1, 13 and 15 are independent. Claim 2 is cancelled herein. Claims 3 through 12 depend from independent Claim 1. Claim 14 depends from independent Claim 13.

Independent apparatus Claim 1 has been amended for clarification to define each of the support panels as "having an integral angled edge that extends around the perimeter thereof, said angled edge being adapted to provide rigidity to said panels and to secure said panels substantially within said plurality of openings of said frame."

Similarly, independent apparatus Claim 13 has been amended for clarification to define each of the panels as having "an integral perimeter edge" with the panels "being substantially fitted within said openings."

Again similarly, independent method Claim 15 has been amended for clarification to include the added and amended steps of "forming a plurality of support panels, each of said support panels having a perimeter and an integral angled edge that extends around said perimeter " and "connecting a said plurality of support panels made of a light weight material onto said frame substantially within said openings by attachment of said edge."

Applicant respectfully submits that these clarifying amendments to independent Claims 1, 13 and 15 overcome the Examiner's rejections. Particularly, the element 42 of is identified in that reference as an "insulating body" and, in fact, is not a panel at all within the meaning of the identifying word as used in the instant application. According to the present invention, the panel is fitted within the space defined by the vertical and horizontal mullions. This may be clearly seen by reference to, for example, Figures 2 and 3. This arrangement is more than mere design choice, as the angled edge gives the entire structure greater integrity.

The arrangement of Krauss *et al.* does not offer this advantage, in spite of its significant complexity. As noted above, the "panel" 42 of Krauss *et al.* is an insulating member and is not a structural member. It is not itself fastened to anything. Instead, the design of Krauss *et al.* depends on a complex supporting arrangement which incorporates flashing 47, its outer flashed edge 48, and a second connecting member 50 which, according to this arrangement, sandwiches the insulator 42 therebetween. Please refer to Figure 6 and its related text. Conversely, the panel of the present invention includes a front portion and *integral* angled edges which may be clearly seen, for example, in Figure 4 as filed.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1, 13 and 15 as currently written overcome the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a). Insofar as Claims 3 through 12 are dependent either directly or indirectly on independent Claim 1 and Claim 14 is directly dependent upon independent Claim 13, Applicant also respectfully that these claims are allowable over the art of record as well.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) are respectfully requested.

### **CONCLUSION**

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending Claims 1 and 3 through 15 as currently presented are in condition for allowance. If, for any reason, the Examiner disagrees, please call the undersigned attorney at 248-433-7552 in an effort to resolve any matter still outstanding *before* issuing another action. The undersigned attorney is confident that any issue which might remain can readily be worked out by telephone.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas T. Moga  
Registration No. 34,881  
Attorney for Applicant

DICKINSON WRIGHT PLLC  
1901 L Street, N.W., Suite 800  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
202-457-0160

Dated: **November 23, 2004**

TTM/hs